

United States Patent and Trademark Office

0

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/695,288	10/28/2003	Donald F. Gordon	SEDN/245CON1	3945
56015 PATTERSON 6	EXAM	EXAMINER		
SEDNA PATENT SERVICES, LLC			SAINT CYR, JEAN D	
595 SHREWSBURY AVENUE SUITE 100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SHREWSBUR	SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702 2609			
			, MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		,	09/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/695,288	GORDON ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Jean D. Saintcyr	2609	· .
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	, -	rith the correspondence add	ess
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAISIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNI 36(a). In no event, however, may a vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this com BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status		•		
2a) <u></u> ☐	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 Or</u> This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal mat		nerits is
Dispositi	on of Claims		•	
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□ Applicati 9)□	Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) is/are object to restriction and/or on Papers The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on 28 October 2003 is/are:	vn from consideration. r election requirement. r.	objected to by the Examiner	
11)[Applicant may not request that any objection to the or Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	ion is required if the drawing	g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR	• •
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)⊠ <i>a</i>)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau see the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in A ity documents have been I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National S	age
2) D Notice 3) Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application	

Art Unit: 2609

DETAILED ACTION

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 3-11 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 3-11 of US. Patent No. 6651252. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 3-11 are obvious variants and encompassed by claims 3-11 of US. Patent '252'.

In the US. Patent 6651252, the applicant did not recite "audio encoder" in claim 1, but he mentioned in claim 2 that the processor comprises "video encoder and an audio encoder". By

Art Unit: 2609

considering claims 1 and 2 as a whole in the US. Patent 6651252, it becomes obvious that claims 1 and 2 of the current application equate to claims 1 and 2 of the US. Patent 6651252. Although the conflict between claims 1 and 2 are not identical, but they are not patentably distinct from each other because these two claims are obvious variants and encompassed by claims 1 and 2 of US. Patent '252'.

Page 3

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US Patent No. 6625810 (Delivery Of Interactive program Guide Data, Murphy et al), this system provides a method of delivering interactive program guide data and non-time-sensitive data to a receiver from which a program guide can be retrieved).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean Duclos Saintcyr whose phone number is 571-270-3224. The examiner can normally reach on M-F 7:30-5:00 PM EST.If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are not successful, his supervisor, Marvin Lateef, can be reach on 571-272-5026. The fax number for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see httpp://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, dial 800-786-9199(IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jean Duclos Saintcyr 08 /28/ 2007 Marvin Lateef / Tuan Ho
Supervisor Patent Examiner/ TA

PRIMARY EXAMINER